DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 922 PS 029 150

AUTHOR Burton, Alice; Mihaly, Jessica; Kagiwada, Jennifer; Whitebook, Marcy

TITLE The CARES Initiative in California: Pursuing Public Policy To Build a Skilled and Stable Child Care Workforce, 1997-2000.

INSTITUTION Center for the Child Care Workforce, Washington, DC.

SPONS AGENCY Miriam and Peter Haas Fund, San Francisco, CA.; San Francisco Foundation, CA.; David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.; William Randolph Hearst Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.; W. Clement and Jessie V. Stone Foundation, Chicago, IL.; Walter and Elise Haas Fund, San Francisco, CA.; Luke B. Hancock Foundation, Reno, NV.; William Randolph Hearst Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.; Marin Community Foundation, San Rafael, CA.

PUB DATE 2000-00-00

NOTE 55p.; Funded by the Quality Child Care Initiative, a Collab oration of the Bay Area Early Childhood Funders Group, including the Jennifer Altman Foundation, California Endowment, East Bay Community Foundation, David B. Gold Foundation, Carol P. Guyer, Evelyn and Watler Hass, Jr. Fund, Hellman Family Fund, Mom's Family Foundation; Peninsula Community Foundation, San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and Families, the Tara Fund, Trio Foundation, United Way of the Bay Area, and Wood Kaufman Family Trust.

AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Child Care Workforce, 733 15th Street, N.W., Suite 1037, Washington, DC 20005-2112; Tel: 202-737-7700; Fax: 202-737-0370; Web site: http://www.ccw.org.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Child Advocacy; *Child Caregivers; Children; *Compensation (Remuneration); *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; *Professional Development; Program Descriptions; *Public Policy; State Programs

IDENTIFIERS *California; Caregiver Qualifications; *Day Care Quality

ABSTRACT

This report details California CARES (Compensation and Retention Encourage Stability), an initiative aimed at building a skilled and stable workforce to provide high-quality child care and development services throughout California. The report is presented in three parts. Part 1 describes the statewide effort to provide professional development rewards for existing and future education and training. This section describes the origins of the initiative in new federal funding sources to states, child care advocacy efforts, statewide demand for K-3 teachers, and the existence of an extensive early childhood training network. Legislative efforts are also described. Part 2 of the document presents information on how California counties have developed CARE-style plans of their own. Discussion focuses on Proposition 10, the San Francisco CARE program, the Alameda County Child Development Corps, and the movement from advocacy to implementation. The following program features are described: (1) stipends and educational requirements; (2) priorities for stipends; (3) timelines; (4) outreach; and

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

(5) program administration. Challenges of implementing CARES at the county level are discussed, including limited planning and implementation time, limited funding, and transcripts and other verifying documents. Part 3 of the document reflects on the CARES experiment, noting that efforts such as CARES are a first step in the longer struggle for systematic change to reward members of the child care workforce. Appended are application materials for San Francisco and Alameda County. (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 448 922

The CARES Initiative in California:

Pursuing Public Policy to Build a Skilled and Stable Child Care Workforce, 1997–2000

by Alice Burton, Jessica Mihaly,
Jennifer Kagiwada and Marcy Whitebook

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE,
AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC
COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY,
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Young

2A TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Center for the Child Care Workforce
Washington, DC

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PS 029150

Acknowledgments

The report was prepared by Alice Burton, Jessica Mihaly, Jennifer Kagiwada and Marcy Whitebook, and edited by Dan Bellm. Special thanks to Rory Darrah, Peyton Nattinger, Sherry Novick, Jim Stockinger and Norman Yee for their thoughtful comments.

This report was made possible through funding from the Quality Child Care Initiative, a collaboration of the Bay Area Early Childhood Funders group, which includes:

Jennifer Altman Foundation, California Endowment, W. Clement and Jessie V. Stone Foundation, East Bay Community Foundation, David B. Gold Foundation, Carol P. Guyer, Evelyn and Walter Haas Jr. Fund, Miriam and Peter Haas Fund, Walter and Elise Haas Fund, Luke B. Hancock Foundation, Hearst Foundation, Hellman Family Fund, Marin Community Foundation, Morris Family Foundation, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Peninsula Community Foundation, The San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and Families, The San Francisco Foundation, The Tara Fund, Trio Foundation, The United Way of the Bay Area, Wood Kaufman Family Trust, and Individual Anonymous Donors.

Design and composition by Archetype Typography, Berkeley, California.

Copyright ©2000 by Center for the Child Care Workforce
All rights reserved

Center for the Child Care Workforce
733 15th Street, N.W., Suite 1037
Washington, DC 20005-2112
TEL (202) 737-7700
FAX (202) 737-0370
www. ccw.org

In California:
2625 Alcatraz Avenue, #199
Berkeley, CA 94705
TEL (510) 654-1778

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

California CARES: The Statewide Effort 3

- Defining the CARES Initiative 3
- The Origins of California CARES 4
- California CARES in the Legislature: 1998-2000 7

Counties Take the Initiative 11

- Proposition 10: California's "Children and Families First" Initiative 12
- San Francisco CARES 13
- The Alameda County Child Development Corps 14
- CARES in San Francisco and Alameda Counties: *Moving from Advocacy to Implementation* 16
- CARES/Child Development Corps Matrix (Chart): *California, San Francisco, and Alameda County Plans in Brief* 18
- Program Features 20
- Administering CARES: *Staffing and Advisory Committees* 23
- Challenges of Implementing CARES at the County Level 28
- Looking Ahead to the Future of CARES 31

Reflections on the CARES Experiment, 1997-2000 33

Appendices: San Francisco and Alameda County Application Materials 37

Introduction

This report details the remarkable story of California CARES (Compensation and Retention Encourage Stability), an initiative aimed at building a skilled and stable workforce to provide high-quality child care and development services throughout the state of California.

In 1997, child care advocates throughout the state gathered to develop plans for what would become the California CARES initiative, at a time when the staffing crisis was at an all-time high and child care centers and providers throughout the state were struggling to stay open due to the lack of qualified staff who could provide consistent, quality care to the state's youngest children.

This report details the remarkable story of California CARES . . ., an initiative aimed at building a skilled and stable workforce to provide high-quality child care and development services throughout the state of California.

California CARES, which establishes a link between training and compensation through its Child Development Corps stipend program, was originally proposed as a legislative initiative and sailed through the state legislature twice with bipartisan support, only to meet with a denial of funds from two governors in two years. In an exciting turn of events, advocates in local communities seized the opportunity to address these issues locally, and two counties, San Francisco and Alameda, successfully gained funds for the San Francisco CARES and Alameda County Child Development Corps programs.

The Center for the Child Care Workforce (CCW) developed the original state-level CARES initiative, and has tracked its progress from the beginning. In a sense, the CARES initiative was the product of twenty years of advocacy in California for better child care staff compensation in California by the Center for the Child Care Workforce and allied organizations and individuals. In 1997, CCW joined with a coalition of child care organizations to design the CARES initiative in consultation with service providers across the state. CCW has

closely followed the legislative journey of the CARES initiative over three years, and has provided coordination and support for other groups committed to its legislative success. Starting in 1999, CCW, with the support of a coalition of San Francisco Bay Area funders called the Quality Child Care Initiative, has provided targeted technical assistance and support to Bay Area counties that are implementing and developing caregiver retention plans.

This report describes the history of the initiative from its beginnings in 1997 through the fall of 2000, when sixteen counties throughout the state were developing their own plans for CARES and Child Development Corps programs,[1] and at the state level, a three-year effort to pass a state initiative finally led to the approval of $15 million in ongoing state funding to support county efforts to retain child care staff in state-subsidized programs.

The CARES initiative is an evolving entity, as counties throughout the state adapt the model to meet local needs and demographics, and as developments at the state level continue to change. This report, by nature, is a snapshot in time, but it also reflects CCW's ongoing involvement with, and commitment to, the CARES/Child Development Corps model.

[1]These counties include: Contra Costa, Humboldt, Kern, Los Angeles, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, Nevada, Sacramento, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, Solano, and Sonoma.

California Cares: The Statewide Effort

Defining the CARES Initiative

As originally written, the California CARES proposal was intended to help build and reward a skilled and stable child care workforce throughout the state through two major programs:

- The *Child Development Corps*, which would include family child care providers and center-based staff (including teachers, site supervisors and directors) who meet certain education and training qualifications, commit to continuing their professional development for at least 21 hours per year, and agree to provide child care services for a specified period of time. Members of the Corps would receive monetary rewards ranging from $500 to $6,000 per year, depending on their education and background.
- *Resources for Retention*, which would provide additional support to public and private child care programs which are committed to improving quality, by providing differential reimbursement rates and Quality Improvement Rewards to help the programs achieve accreditation and improve staff retention.

While CARES addresses the compensation of the child care workforce by providing professional development rewards for existing and future education and training, it does not raise these workers' base salaries or hourly earnings, and thus cannot strictly be considered a "compensation initiative."

While each county is free to make variations on this model to meet local needs, the five points below define the core principles of California CARES:

1. The Child Development Corps is open to home-based, licensed and exempt family child care providers, family child care assistants, and

center-based staff in public and private child care programs. In center-based programs, all teaching staff and all administrative staff who supervise their work with children are eligible, regardless of job title and program type, including for-profit, faith-based, private nonprofit, and subsidized programs.

2. Stipends reward individuals both for attained education and for continuing education and professional growth.
3. Stipend increments are based on the Child Development Permit Matrix, the statewide professional development system for teaching and administrative staff. The Matrix system is a requirement for certain subsidized programs that must meet more stringent funding requirements (Title 5), and can be voluntarily adopted by other programs.
4. Stipends reward individuals who have been at their current child care job for a minimum of one year.
5. Stipends for those with higher levels of education seek to bridge the gap between child care and elementary school salaries.

The Origins of California CARES

California child care advocates have long sought an initiative that would significantly improve the compensation of teachers and providers in an underpaid field. The passage in 1990 of a major new federal funding source to states, the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG), appeared to offer that opportunity. Among its provisions, the CCDBG has allowed states to set aside or target funds for child care quality improvement, including such activities as improving compensation and professional development. The California Early Childhood Mentor Program, which offers training and stipends to experienced teachers who mentor newer staff, was an early recipient of this quality improvement funding through CCDBG. The Mentor Program, however, while notable as a landmark statewide effort to link professional development with better pay, was not in itself designed to improve compensation for a wide cross-section of the overall child care workforce.

California child care advocates have long sought an initiative that would significantly improve the compensation of teachers and providers in an underpaid field.

As child care advocates, in public forums across the state, voiced their growing frustration and concern with high turnover rates and a shortage of qualified staff, the Child Development Division of the California Department of Education

commissioned a study in 1995 of center-based child care workforce compensation in California.[2] Findings from the study, jointly authored by CCW and the American Institutes for Research, demonstrated what most child care practitioners knew all too well: child care jobs for teaching staff and directors offer very low wages and few benefits in spite of the relatively highly educated workforce occupying these positions. *The California Child Care and Development Compensation Study* (1996) also laid out a series of policy recommendations, proposing several pilot programs that would address the need both to raise the low wage floor for entry-level positions in child care, and to significantly improve the salaries of the best-educated child care teachers, providers, and directors, whose education and years of service are grossly under-rewarded. Several of the recommended pilot projects were implemented, including a two-year training program for public assistance (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF) recipients, preparing them for better-paying jobs in the child care field; the development of staff compensation guidelines for center based programs[3]; and a statewide series of training events for child care center directors entitled "Taking On Turnover," conducted by CCW staff.

One year after the publication of the Child Care and Development Compensation Study, advocates were hearing a growing level of desperation in directors' complaints about the difficulty of attracting and retaining child care center staff. A statewide class-size reduction policy in grades K-3, which fueled a demand for K-3 teachers and led to a relaxation of the teacher credential requirements in many school districts in the state, provided a new employment opportunity for child care teaching staff with bachelor's degrees and above during this period. And as the California economy improved after the slump of the early 1990s, fewer entry-level staff were available because of better-paying jobs in other fields. Directors reported that it was difficult now to attract and retain staff with *any* level of qualification, jeopardizing their efforts to maintain or expand their enrollments, and in particular, to accommodate the growing number of children whose parents were leaving welfare for work.

Directors reported that it was difficult now to attract and retain staff with any level of qualification, jeopardizing their efforts to maintain or expand their enrollments, and . . . accommodate the growing number of children whose parents were leaving welfare for work.

[2] The study was commissioned to document child care center compensation and did not include family child care providers; the recommendations made by the study's authors, however, did encompass family child care.

[3] Center for the Child Care Workforce, *Child Care Staff Compensation Guidelines for California 1998*.

In November 1997, the staff of the San Francisco-based Early Childhood Professional Development Initiative convened child care advocates from around the state to consider developing a compensation initiative for California. Sue Russell, Executive Director of Day Care Services in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, spoke to the group about that state's T.E.A.C.H. Early Childhood™ program, which provides scholarships for training as well as financial rewards for those who complete their training and stay on the job. A similar meeting took place in Los Angeles. Both groups were very interested in the T.E.A.C.H. model and considered adopting the program for California.

After a critical analysis of California's needs and the strengths of the T.E.A.C.H. model, however, the groups decided that, although T.E.A.C.H. contained some of the elements they needed to address the staffing crisis, the program as a whole was not the right match for California's needs. The decision to develop a new program for California centered around two factors: the existence of a relatively extensive and accessible training system for early childhood teachers in California, offering free or low-cost college courses; and the shared perception that any effective initiative in California would need not only to support and encourage entry-level workers, but to reward and recognize those teachers, directors and providers who had already received educational credentials, such as associate's and bachelor's degrees. Approximately one-quarter of California's early childhood teachers have bachelor's degrees or higher, and retaining these well-trained members of the workforce had become California's primary child care staffing challenge.

In response, the Center for the Child Care Workforce took the lead in developing a new model for California, with input from a broad-based coalition of child care organizations including the California Association for the Education of Young Children, the California Early Childhood Mentor Program, the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network, the California School Age Consortium, the California Federated Family Child Care Association, the Private Association for California Educators, and representatives from other sectors of the child care field. The result was the California CARES initiative, which proposed state funding for a pilot program to be launched in several counties. The intention of CCW and other CARES supporters was to develop an initiative that could galvanize and unify the diverse members of the child care workforce by allowing for eligibility across different sectors of care, program types, and job titles.[4]

[4]Center for Child Care Workforce staff members Marcy Whitebook and Jessica Mihaly drafted the initial and subsequent California CARES plans, which became Assembly Bill 2025, and later Assembly Bill 212.

California CARES in the Legislature: 1998-2000

Although California CARES did not ultimately become law at the state level, the impact of this three-year legislative effort on local communities who have worked to promote CARES cannot be over-estimated. By receiving bipartisan support for three years in the California legislature, California CARES provided a symbolic success that helped local advocates argue for similar initiatives at the county and community level. Although two governors blocked the legislation from becoming law in 1998 and 1999, legislators who voted for CARES in Sacramento have been visible allies in convincing city and county officials of the importance of supporting CARES with local dollars. The California Labor Federation and its local members lent their influence and skills by organizing broad support for CARES, which has also provided important energy in maintaining this effort.

By receiving bipartisan support for three years in the California legislature, California CARES provided a symbolic success that helped local advocates argue for similar initiatives at the county and community level.

1998 California Legislative Session: Launching a New Initiative

Assemblywoman Dion Aroner, a Democrat representing parts of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, enthusiastically agreed to carry California CARES in the state Assembly, and in 1998 became legislative author of Assembly Bill 2025. The California Association for the Education of Young Children (CAEYC) joined the Center for the Child Care Workforce (CCW) as a committed co-sponsor to campaign for AB2025. The California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, became the third co-sponsor, launching a unique coalition between labor and child care, and lending political clout to the effort to increase compensation and retention in the child care field. The Labor Project for Working Families, a nonprofit organization which builds coalitions between community groups and organized labor, was instrumental in bringing the California Labor Federation in as a partner with CCW and CAEYC.

CCW and CAEYC took the leadership in rallying the early childhood community to lobby for the bill, and in 1998, AB2025 passed both houses of the California legislature. Ultimately, however, it failed to receive support from then-Governor Pete Wilson, who vetoed the bill.

Despite Gov. Wilson's veto, passage of the bill in both legislative houses was seen as an enormous and even surprising success to advocates, who had steeled themselves for a multi-year legislative lobbying effort. CARES received strong bipartisan support in both the Assembly and Senate, and to the AB2025 supporters who had been working for many years in California to improve child care

compensation, these first-year results provided fresh hope and encouragement for their efforts. Perhaps an even greater success lay in the unprecedented coalition-building and consensus among organizations and sectors of the child care field, who came together with a united voice to support California CARES and to articulate the imperative for state and local governments to address the child care staffing crisis.

1999 Session: Introducing a Revised Initiative

In 1999, California CARES was reintroduced as AB212, and again passed the state Assembly. In an effort to fund the bill, Assemblywoman Aroner identified $10 million in funds from the federal Child Care and Development Block Grant that was available for child care quality improvement. The legislature's Budget Conference Committee agreed to include those funds in the budget it sent the Governor, targeting the $10 million for implementation of AB212. Unfortunately, when the budget bill reached newly-elected Democratic Governor Gray Davis, he agreed with his Republican predecessor and "blue penciled" the funds for AB212, removing them from the budget.

Governor Davis stated his reasons for vetoing the funds in the following message:

> While turnover in the child care profession may create problems for certain communities in filling vacancies in a timely manner, I am not convinced that this [CARES] approach is warranted. I am concerned with both introducing direct state subsidies into an occupation or profession which is subject to local market forces as well as establishing a costly new state responsibility that will grow rapidly over time. In addition, this augmentation results in an additional transfer from the TANF surplus which creates additional encroachment on General Fund resources in the future. Proposition 10[5] provides funding at local discretion to improve early childhood development programs. This source may be an alternative to the extent local commissions believe the problems of staff turnover are of sufficient local priority. In any event, I believe local discretion is preferable to creation of a costly new statewide program."

Rather than giving up at this point, advocates agreed that the issue should stay alive in the state legislature. Assemblywoman Aroner agreed, and was able to have AB212 classified as a two-year bill, placing it on hold until 2000 and providing advocates another year to revise the bill to address the Governor's concerns and to convince him that this issue merited funding.

---

[5]Proposition 10, also known as Children and Families First, an initiative passed by California voters in 1998, created a 50-cent-per-package tobacco tax designed to provide funds to counties for child development and health services for children ages zero to five.

2000 Session: Seeking to Address the Governor's Concerns

In response to the Governor's 1999 budget veto message, AB212 was amended in 2000 as a state matching grant effort to assist counties that were implementing CARES/Child Development Corps models. Whereas in 1998 and 1999, California CARES was designed as a statewide program to be implemented in a small number of pilot counties, the newly-amended version called for the state to match local monies spent on CARES-type programs—particularly since San Francisco and Alameda Counties had already approved such efforts, and several other counties were in the process of developing them.

As a two-year bill, the legislation picked up where it had left off in the previous year, in the Senate Health and Human Services Committee. Again, Assemblywoman Aroner and advocates had to identify funds to include in the budget in order to finance the bill. In June 2000, the issue of funding for AB 212 moved through the Legislature's budget process with surprising results. Advocates had originally requested $6 million for the bill, although hopes were not high, due to the concern that the Governor had made his decision clear in 1999, and that the legislature would not want to propose budget items that the Governor would be unlikely to sign. Assemblywoman Aroner, however, continued to lobby for the funding, and the Women's Caucus of the legislature put forward a budget proposal for child care which included $24 million for AB212. The Budget Conference Committee, comprised of members of the Assembly and Senate, voted to allocate $15 million to AB212, more than double what advocates had originally requested.

But although the Women's Caucus was able to convince Governor Davis to include the $15 million in his 2000-2001 budget, the Governor's budget message mirrored his previous misgivings, and required the legislature to send him a bill to spend the $15 million that he would be comfortable signing—i.e., a bill different from the current version of AB212. Pending serious compromise, AB212 ran the risk of another defeat.

During the last week of the legislative session, Dion Aroner, her staff, and advocates worked tirelessly to try to salvage something from AB212. Two days before the end of the session, a compromise was reached to provide ongoing State Department of Education funds to county child care planning councils to support local efforts "to address the retention of qualified child care employees in state-subsidized

During the last week of the legislative session, . . . advocates worked tirelessly to try to salvage something from AB212. Two days before the end of the session, a compromise was reached to provide ongoing . . . funds to county child care planning councils to support local efforts "to address the retention of qualified child care employees in state-subsidized child care centers."

child care centers." While the bill's co-sponsors and advocates viewed this amendment as no longer recognizable as California CARES, they realized that the $15 million to assist staff retention in state-subsidized child care centers could free up other child care staff retention funds already designated at the local level, in order to serve non-subsidized programs. AB212, as amended, was signed by Governor Davis on September 20, 2000, making it effective as law on January 1, 2001.

Counties Take the Initiative

Spurred on by success in the state legislature and a growing need to address their local child care staffing crises, advocates in San Francisco and Alameda counties used the template of the state model to develop plans to implement CARES/Child Development Corps programs with local funds. In 1999, San Francisco invested $1.15 million of its City and County General funds to establish San Francisco CARES, and Alameda County invested $3.8 million from Proposition 10 (tobacco tax) funds to establish the Alameda County Child Development Corps. Profiles of these initiatives are included below.

By 2000, encouraged by these successes in San Francisco and Alameda counties, at least 16 other counties and cities around the state had begun to develop CARES-style plans of their own. It was fortunate and timely that Proposition 10—a 50-cent-per-package tobacco tax passed by California voters in 1998, and designed to provide funds to counties for child development and health services for children ages zero to five – offered a substantial new source of funding at the county level. The availability of Proposition 10 funds galvanized child care advocates to seek solutions to low compensation and the inadequate supply of workers in child care, and many county child care policy makers, charged with serving a growing number of families, came to identify the CARES model as an important part of the solution to this complex capacity-building problem.

In 1999, as San Francisco and Alameda County were finalizing their CARES/Child Development Corps plans, and many other counties were expressing an interest in the model, the Center for the Child Care Workforce received a Quality Child Care Initiative grant from the Early Childhood Funders' Collaborative to

The availability of Proposition 10 funds galvanized child care advocates to seek solutions to low compensation and the inadequate supply of workers in child care, and many county child care policy makers, . . . came to identify the CARES model as an important part of the solution to this complex capacity-building problem.

provide technical assistance and coordination to eight Bay Area counties, supporting their efforts to develop and implement local CARES or Child Development Corps programs. With this grant, CCW began convening monthly meetings of local leaders to share strategies, coordinate county efforts, and influence state legislation. Participants have included representatives from Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Napa, Nevada, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Sacramento and Sonoma Counties. CCW also attended meetings in a number of these counties to provide technical assistance and "cross-fertilize" information. The interconnectedness of the Bay Area economy inspired counties to work together, and increased the necessity of coordination. Instituting CARES in San Francisco and Alameda, for example, placed more pressure on neighboring counties such as Marin, Contra Costa and San Mateo to develop stipend programs of their own, out of concern that locally-employed child care workers might seek work in a county with a CARES/Child Development Corps program.

One example of this collaboration between counties was their request to CCW to draft a generic resolution of support for AB212 to be adopted by their own county Boards of Supervisors, child care planning councils, and other representative bodies. As of June 2000, the resolution had been signed by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, the Los Angeles Children and Families First Commission, the Napa County Board of Supervisors, the Alameda County Child Care Planning Council, the San Francisco County Board of Supervisors, the Sonoma State University's Children's School Governing Board, and the Joint Meeting of the University of California and California State University Child Care Directors.

During this same period, in fall 1999, the state Proposition 10 Commission awarded $1 million to the Policy Analysis in California Education (PACE) Institute at the University of California at Berkeley, to evaluate child care compensation programs in California. San Francisco CARES and the Alameda County Child Development Corps will make up a major focus of this evaluation.

Proposition 10: California's "Children and Families First" Initiative

In 1998, California voters passed a ballot initiative called Proposition 10, "California Children and Families First," which assesses a 50-cent-per-pack tax on cigarettes. Funds made available through "Prop 10" must be spent on programs that focus on children ages zero to five, and must fall into three general categories: child care and development, parent education and support, and child health. Funds are awarded and distributed through specially-designated Children

and Families Commissions (or "Prop 10 Commissions") in each county. In a number of counties, child care advocates are submitting proposals for CARES-type programs to their local commissions, each of which is moving at its own schedule and pace, providing unique challenges and opportunities for local advocates.

In addition, the California State Children and Families Commission serves as a statewide umbrella entity whose responsibilities include developing guidelines for the counties, reviewing county plans, and distributing funds to the counties. The state commission retains 20 percent of funds generated through the tobacco tax, and can use those dollars to fund research, evaluation and program implementation. Since the spring of 2000, the state commission has been considering a proposal to use a portion of its dollars to provide matching grants to counties that fund their own child care workforce compensation and retention programs. Approval of this plan is anticipated in the fall of 2000.

San Francisco CARES

On July 19, 1999, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors became the first local entity in the state to support a child care workforce stipend program, allocating $1.15 million from its General Fund (not Proposition 10 funds) to San Francisco CARES for fiscal year 2000. Political support for CARES by San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown and County Supervisor Mabel Teng was the result of a well-organized grassroots campaign spearheaded by a coalition of child care and youth advocates, including the San Francisco Child Care Providers Association, Wu Yee Children's Services, and Coleman Advocates for Youth. Hundreds of teachers, providers and parents let their voices be heard by writing numerous letters, filling public hearings and forums to capacity, and lining up to offer testimony. This city-wide advocacy effort, which began in early 1999 with the release of Coleman Advocates' "Young Children's Budget," naming better compensation for the child care workforce as its number-one priority, paid off in victory only seven months later, thanks to an active child care constituency and supportive public officials. Another crucial source of support to the San Francisco effort was the existence of AB212/California CARES at the state level, which provided a template for the program, the potential of state matching funds, and statewide political momentum.

Political support for CARES . . . was the result of a well-organized grassroots campaign spearheaded by a coalition of child care and youth advocates, including the San Francisco Child Care Providers Association, Wu Yee Children's Services, and Coleman Advocates for Youth.

Two organizations became involved in planning the contours of San Francisco

CARES early on: the San Francisco Child Care Providers Association and the San Francisco Early Childhood Professional Development Initiative. Later, this coalition grew to include the Child Care Law Center, the Bay Area Worthy Wage Campaign, the San Francisco Association for the Education of Young Children, and City College of San Francisco.

The City of San Francisco allocated funds to the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF), which in turn developed a Request for Proposals and put the administration of the San Francisco CARES program out to bid. Wu Yee Children's Services, one of two resource and referral agencies in San Francisco and an early supporter of the CARES model, was awarded the contract in January 2000. Wu Yee was charged with hiring staff, setting up administrative and priority systems, and conducting outreach to a multilingual child care community, in order to enable as many teachers and providers as possible to apply. By the May 1 deadline, Wu Yee had received 1,238 applications for an estimated 450 grants.

Due to this large number of applicants, and the need to start up and run a new program in an extremely short time, implementing San Francisco CARES in Year 1 was an intensive and challenging process. Nonetheless, the Child Development Corps was successfully launched in July 2000 with approximately 450 center-based staff and family child care providers receiving the first stipend checks.

The Alameda County Child Development Corps

Alameda County child care advocates followed the success of San Francisco by making some history of their own: representatives of the Alameda County Child Care Planning Council, working in concert with the Alameda Children and Families Commission (the administrator of county Proposition 10 funds), established the largest local child care workforce initiative in the country by approving $3.8 million in funding for fiscal year 2000.

Located just across the bay from San Francisco, Alameda County child care programs were experiencing the same interconnected problems as their neighbors: a high cost of living, low compensation, a limited pool of qualified staff, and high turnover. As a large, densely-populated county encompassing 14 cities, 688 child care centers, and an estimated 3,783 center staff, 2,517 family child care providers and their employees, and 1,068 non-teaching center staff. Alameda

. . . representatives of the Alameda County Child Care Planning Council, working in concert with the Alameda Children and Families Commission . . ., established the largest local child care workforce initiative in the country by approving $3.8 million in funding for fiscal year 2000.

County had an equally pressing need for a well-funded compensation initiative. The county's success lay, in part, in its ability to identify and capture a substantial first-time funding source. The Alameda Child Care Planning Council, a representative body of child care directors, teaching staff, family child care providers, parents, resource and referral agencies, social service and health agencies, and community colleges, took the lead in advocating for CARES and drafting a local plan for the Prop 10 Commission.

With a rich history of child care worker advocacy and a variety of effective community-based organizations, Alameda County advocates were poised to define the needs of the child care community and to mobilize caregivers, parents and others to speak on behalf of a Child Development Corps in Proposition 10 hearings and other community forums. A particularly well-attended event was a public policy forum in May 1999 entitled "Speak Out for Staffing Issues," convened by local policy makers and state legislators.

Child care advocates in Alameda County recognized early on that, along with activism within their own constituency, they would need to persuade the Commissioners representing children's health and family support services of the relevance of the Child Development Corps model to child care quality and children's developmental outcomes, if they were to win funding for this effort. Forging a commitment from these constituent groups, to share funding and to collaborate across disciplines to develop initiatives whenever possible, was central to gaining support for the Corps and other Alameda County child development initiatives.

Alameda County, like San Francisco, also benefited from the statewide CARES legislative effort that provided a template for a proposal and helped leverage local support, notably through the involvement of State Assemblywoman Dion Aroner, whose district includes parts of Alameda County.

Alameda County child care advocacy organizations—including BANANAS, one of three resource and referral agencies in the county, the Alameda Child Care Planning Council, and others—were also seasoned players in the effort to improve child care quality through training and staff retention efforts. These advocates, for example, had been instrumental in developing a City of Berkeley-funded precursor of the Corps in 1997 that offered stipends to reward child care teachers and providers for their training and job retention. The Berkeley initiative gained advocates valuable experience in conducting outreach and building coalitions across the child care center and family child care communities, across public and private programs, and with teaching and administrative staff.

In addition, the Center for the Child Care Workforce (CCW) got its start in Alameda County in 1978 as the Child Care Employee Project, helping to launch a long history of local advocacy to improve child care compensation. CCW

developed the Bay Area Worthy Wage Campaign, and co-developed the California Early Childhood Mentor Program with the Chabot College Department of Early Childhood Education. The child care planning council, and the resource and referral agencies of Alameda County, have regularly commissioned CCW to conduct local studies of child care center staff wages, benefits, and working conditions, which have proved instrumental in describing and tracking the compensation issue over time.

Alameda County was the first in the state to complete and submit its "Prop 10" plan, called "Every Child Counts," to the state Children and Families Commission. Alameda County's Children and Families Commission received a head start when the Director of the County Health Department allocated department funds to hire an Executive Director and two other staff for the commission, before any state Prop 10 funding had arrived.

In December 1999, the Alameda County Children and Families Commission allocated $3.8 million of its $6.5 million early care and education fund to create the Alameda County Child Development Corps. The county's Early Care and Education Plan also included three other components: quality improvement grants to child care programs; site improvement loans and grants; and a recruitment, training and coordination program for community agencies.

The Child Development Corps was launched in May 2000. The Alameda County Children and Families Commission, which administered the program, conducted intensive community outreach to encourage all eligible caregivers and administrators to apply. By the application deadline of June 30, the commission had received 2,399 qualified applications, and stipend checks were distributed in September. Follow-up seminars and professional development activities for first-year Corps members were then scheduled to take place between October 2000 and March 2001.

CARES in San Francisco and Alameda Counties: Moving from Advocacy to Implementation

As they built support and sought funding for CARES/Child Development Corps initiatives, San Francisco and Alameda County advocates also laid the groundwork for program implementation. When funding became available, both counties had to quickly refine their plans, hire staff and establish administrative systems, in order to implement the programs in a timely and effective way. In Alameda County, a subcommittee of the local child care planning council began planning CARES on a weekly basis for nine months prior to receiving Prop 10 Funds. In addition, groups and individuals representing community college instructors, child care center directors, family child care providers, center staff,

resource and referral agencies, and the Children and Families Commission were asked to review the plan and offer input. During a eight-month planning period, members of the San Francisco Child Care Provider's Association met regularly to refine the CARES bill to meet the needs of San Francisco's child care workforce.

CARES advocates pursuing the Prop 10 funding process in Alameda County worked to identify and encourage common ground with representatives of the health care and child development professions on the Prop 10 Commission. During this pre-funding planning period, a "bridge committee," comprised of representatives of the child health, mental health and child care/child development fields, drafted sub-sections of an overall Prop 10 plan for Alameda County, of which CARES was a part. The drafts ultimately were consolidated into one coordinated plan. More discussion of developing common ground between child care and health care representatives in the Prop 10 decision-making process is included in the "Challenges" section of this report.

CARES advocates pursuing the Prop 10 funding process in Alameda County worked to identify and encourage common ground with representatives of the health care and child development professions on the Prop 10 Commission.

In their first year of operation, the counties made modifications to the California CARES model in areas such as stipend amounts, prioritizing limited funds, and minimal education levels required for participation in the Child Development Corps. The local CARES plans that emerged from the planning efforts – San Francisco CARES and the Alameda County Child Development Corps – reflect the specific needs of the communities articulated in the planning process, and the values and commitments of those who advocated for CARES in their respective counties. In San Francisco, social justice activists, low-income teachers and providers, and allied organizations shaped the campaign for CARES together with long-time child care advocates, resulting in a plan that prioritizes low-income caregivers who meet the educational eligibility criteria. The Alameda Child Development Corps, which was driven largely by child care advocates concerned with the interrelated problems of low compensation, inadequate teacher and provider qualifications, and low child care quality, set a higher educational requirement for eligibility than did San Francisco CARES and the proposed California plan.

The plans described here reflect the programs in their first year of operation, and are likely to change in subsequent years. Both communities are conducting internal evaluations and are looking to the findings of the PACE evaluation to make modifications in their programs as needed. The following matrix summarizes the features of the proposed California CARES model, as well as those of San Francisco and Alameda Counties.

CARES Child Development Corps Matrix

	California CARES Proposed AB212	San Francisco CARES Year One	Alameda County Child Development Corps Year One	California Final AB212 Legislation Passed September 2000
Funding Allocated or Requested	To provide matching funds to those counties implementing local initiatives	$1.15 million City General Fund	$3.8 million Proposition 10 funds	$15 million for state subsidized programs implementing staff retention plans
Minimum Education Requirements	12 early childhood education (ECE) units	6 ECE units	12 ECE units	
Employment Requirements				
Type of Program	Licensed or Exempt	Licensed	Licensed or Exempt	State subsidized
Length	At current site at least 1 year	At current site at least 1 year	At current site at least 9 months	
Work Hours	35 hours/wk for full stipend; stipends prorated for < 35 hrs	35 hours/wk for full stipend; stipends prorated for < 35 hrs	Minimum 20 hours/week, stipends not prorated	
Work Year			Minimum 9 months/year	
Other Requirements	Must care for at least 3 children, on average, per year	Must care for at least 3 children, on average, per year	Must care for children 5 years and under (Prop. 10 requirement)	
Job Titles	Teaching Staff, Center Administrators, Licensed Family Child Care Providers, In-Home Providers, Exempt Providers	Teaching Staff, Center Administrators, Licensed Family Child Care Providers	Teaching Staff, Center Administrators, Licensed Family Child Care Providers, In-Home Providers, Exempt Providers	
Tiering/Stipend Amounts	**Level 1** 6–12 ECE $500 **Level 2** (per Permit Matrix) Teacher $1500 Master Teacher $2500 Site Supervisor Program Director Master Tchr+BA $5000 Site Supervisor +BA Program Director +BA	**Level 1** 6-12 ECE $500 **Level 2** (per Permit Matrix) Teacher $1500 Master Teacher $2500 Site Supervisor Program Director Master Tchr +BA $5000 Site Supervisor +BA Program Director +BA	**Maximum Stipend Amounts**[1] **Level 1** T1 12 ECE $ 500 T2 18 ECE $ 750 T3 24 ECE $1000 T4 24 ECE+8 GE $1250 **Level 2** T1 24 ECE+16 GE $1500 T2 24 ECE+16 GE $2500 +6 specialized/admin +2 adult supervision Or AA w/24 ECE +6 specialized/admin +2 adult supervision T3 BA w/24 ECE $6000 +6 specialized/admin +2 adult supervision	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	California CARES Proposed AB212	San Francisco CARES Year One	Alameda County Child Development Corps Year One	California Final AB212 Legislation Passed September 2000
Additional Stipend Factors	Second Language: +$500/yr Graduate Degree: +$500/yr	Second Language: +$500/yr Graduate Degree: +$500/yr	Second Language: +$500/yr Graduate Degree: +$500/yr	
Priority for Stipends	**Level 1:** Assoc. Teachers earning < $10/hour **Level 2:** Teachers < $15/hr Master Teachers < $18/hr Site Supervisors < $21/hr Prog. Directors < $24/hr **Other factors:** # years in child care # years in current program # years in child care in CA	**Level 1:** Assoc. Teachers earning < $10/hour **Level 2:** Teachers < $15/hr Master Teachers < $18/hr Site Supervisors < $21/hr Prog. Directors < $24/hr **Other factors:** # years in child care # years in current program # years in child care in SF SF resident		
Distribution	Minimum of 50% of stipend allocation must be spent on Level 2 stipends	400 Stipends 50% of stipends to Level 1 50% of stipends to Level 2	2,400 Stipends Certain % to each Level/Tier, as determined by estimates of number of staff employed at each level	
Continued Eligibility	Remains employed at same child care program for one year **Level 1:** Year 2 – Completed 3 ECE Units Year 3 – Reached Assoc. Teacher level + 3 units field work or practicum **Level 2:** 21 Hours Prof. Growth per year	Remains employed at same child care program for one year **Level 1:** Year 2 – Completed 3 ECE Units Year 3 – Reached Assoc. Teacher level + 3 units fieldwork or practicum **Level 2:** 21 Hours Prof. Growth per year	Remains employed at same child care program for nine months.[1] **Level 1:** Min. 3 ECE Units or equivalent hours Prof. Growth per year **Level 2:** 21 Hours Prof. Growth or moves to next Tier per year	
Family Child Care Provision	Must meet same educational requirements May substitute experience hours required by Matrix w/ hours accrued doing FCC	Must meet same educational requirements May substitute experience hours required by Matrix w/ hours accrued doing FCC	Must meet same educational and professional development requirements as center staff.	
Resources for Retention or Related Quality Initiatives[2]	No, not as amended from AB2025	Yes	Yes	

[1] All qualified applicants will receive a stipend; maximum amounts may be reduced for the Alameda Child Development Corps depending on demand.
[2] Includes Quality Improvement Grants to improve staff retention, for example by developing retirement plans.
[3] Other requirements include: applies for Child Development Permit, attends Corps orientation seminar, attends an Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale (ECERS) Assessment Workshop, and conducts a program and self-assessment with the ECERS. Applicants must reapply each year.

Program Features

Stipends and Educational Requirements

The California Child Development Permit Matrix provides the educational framework for the CARES/Child Development Corps stipends. The Alameda Child Development Corps, however, departed somewhat from the California and San Francisco models, which adhere more closely to Matrix job titles and requirements for such positions as Teacher, Master Teacher and Site Supervisor. Alameda County created a stipend structure with seven tiers, rather than the state's four, allowing for additional opportunities for Corps members to make small advances between levels. In the state model, for example, a Level 1 Stipend requires 12 units of early childhood education (ECE), and the first tier of Level 2 requires a "Teacher" permit, consisting of 24 ECE units and 16 General Education units. Alameda's plan includes four tiers for Level 1, with graduated educational requirements and smaller monetary increments leading up to a Level 2, Tier 1 stipend. Alameda included the additional tiers with the hope that they would provide more immediate incentives to caregivers and administrators considering additional education.

Priorities for Stipends

San Francisco and Alameda came to different conclusions about prioritizing applicants largely because of different funding levels. Representatives from both communities, however, view their decisions about prioritization as open to future review, even if they were expedient for the first year.

San Francisco and Alameda came to different conclusions about prioritizing applicants largely because of different funding levels. Representatives from both communities, however, view their decisions about prioritization as open to future review, even if they were expedient for the first year.

San Francisco CARES was able to offer only 450 stipends in the first year, after receiving 1,238 applications. While a number of applicants were ineligible (for example, because they had been employed in a licensed child care facility for less than one year), most met the eligibility criteria, leaving the program's developers with the need to establish a system of priority. San Francisco adopted an hourly wage ceiling which gave priority to teaching and administrative staff earning less than the wage limit, as defined by program administrators, for their job title. San Francisco CARES also sought to reward those with greater seniority—whether within their current child care program, in San Francisco child care programs, or in the child care field as a whole. San Francisco residents were also given priority. By adopting these admittedly complicated priorities, the program's developers were able to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

select recipients more consistently and fairly. The disadvantage of this approach was that only a fraction of the eligible applicants could be served, and ultimately, many applicants were disappointed that they did not receive a stipend.

With a budget more than three times greater than San Francisco's, Alameda planners decided to make CARES a universal program for all eligible caregivers and administrators in the county who sought a stipend during the application period, recognizing that in some cases, stipend amounts would have to be reduced. While initially considering the possibility of prioritizing the most economically needy applicants for stipends, Alameda administrators and their community advisors decided that an important goal of the Child Development Corps was to reward and encourage professional development in the early childhood field by rewarding a broad spectrum of teachers and providers regardless of their income level. Alameda County planners also felt strongly that it would be better to spread the benefits of the Child Development Corps to as many recipients as possible – thereby helping to raise public awareness of the link between compensation and the quality of services, and at the same time building a broader constituency of child care workers willing to advocate for CARES. The difficulty of assessing family child care providers' incomes also contributed to the decision to forgo setting income-based priorities. As in San Francisco, these prioritization policies will be re-examined in the second year.

Timelines

Because of the demands of public funding cycles, and the urgency of the child care staffing crises in San Francisco and Alameda Counties, planning and implementation for CARES were compressed into a short period of time. San Francisco CARES administrators, in particular, had a very brief period in which to staff their operation, develop applications, publicize the program and process applications. Although the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF) and community stakeholders had defined some elements of the program, drawing on the proposed California CARES legislation, Wu Yee Children's Services was not funded until January 2000 to refine the program and put it into action.

Outreach

San Francisco and Alameda administrators had a short window of time in which to publicize CARES to their respective populations, and they responded by mounting aggressive campaigns geared to the communities they were trying to reach. In the end, both communities generated a tremendous response to CARES and received a relatively high number of applications for a program in its first year. The program administrators achieved this goal through a variety of

CARES First Year Timelines

San Francisco CARES First Year Timeline

Pre-Funding Planning Period	December 1998–July 1999
Funding granted by San Francisco Board of Supervisors to DCYF for San Francisco CARES	August 1999
DCYF requests proposals to administer San Francisco CARES	October 1999
Funding granted to Wu Yee Children's Services to administer San Francisco CARES	December 1999
Launch of San Francisco CARES	February 2000
Applications due	May 2000
Stipends granted to San Francisco CARES recipients	June 2000

Alameda County Child Development Corps First Year Timeline

Pre-Funding Planning Period	January–November 1999
Alameda County Children and Families Commission Funds the Alameda County Child Development Corps	December 1999
Launch of Alameda County Child Development Corps	May 2000
Applications due	June 2000
Stipends granted to Alameda County Child Development Corps members	September 2000

methods, including kick-off events, featuring public officials, which were covered by the local media. Both programs used colorful posters which were displayed not only in child care settings, but in public places such as community centers, laundromats and public libraries. In San Francisco, the eye-catching CARES poster was titled "My Teacher is Leaving," and featured a photograph of a young boy with a tear coming down his face, with the tag line, "San Francisco CARES about its teachers and wants them to stay."

Developing multilingual materials, and providing multilingual staff to assist applicants, also made outreach to centers and family child care homes much more effective in both communities.

Developing multilingual materials, and providing multilingual staff to assist applicants, also made outreach to centers and family child care homes much more effective in both communities. San Francisco provided outreach, assistance and documentation in the city's three major languages, English, Spanish and Cantonese; trilingual materials and activities included application forms, cover letters, posters, brochures, orientation sessions held throughout the city, and a CARES hot line. In Alameda, information in English, Spanish and Cantonese was sent to each family child care home

and center. Multiple applications were sent to child care centers, one for each eligible staff member at each site, with estimates based on licensed capacity. Corps advisors who were fluent in English, Spanish, Cantonese and Farsi conducted outreach and were available for questions by phone. Alameda County's resource and referral agencies and community colleges played a large role in the outreach.

In San Francisco, where CARES administrators had a particularly short time period in which to publicize the program, staff sent out an "early alert" letter to all centers and homes, encouraging recipients to look for the forthcoming application, inviting them to attend one of three upcoming orientations, and suggesting that interested applicants begin to gather their transcripts. Shortly after the early warning, applications were sent with a cover letter to all licensed centers and homes in San Francisco, and all recipients were called by phone to alert them to the mailing. San Francisco CARES administrators also tapped the wide network of San Francisco-based child care organizations to notify their memberships and constituencies, including students of all child development courses at City College of San Francisco.

Administering CARES: Staffing and Advisory Committees

San Francisco CARES and Alameda County Child Development Corps planners have made some similar decisions about staffing and advisory committees, but there are also notable differences. Both employ full-time coordinators to handle the day-to-day operation of the programs, as well as a small corps of contract employees to assist applicants during the application period. For copies of the San Francisco and Alameda application materials, see Appendices 1 and 2. Additionally, both programs established at least two advisory groups to help guide CARES policy and implementation. Staffing decisions made by the administrators of San Francisco CARES were dictated to some extent by the very limited time frame, whereas the Alameda program had somewhat more time to hire staff.

San Francisco

San Francisco CARES is administered by Wu Yee Children's Services, a San Francisco child care resource and referral agency and service provider with a longstanding relationship to local child care directors, teachers, providers and families. These ties to the community proved important as Wu Yee was faced with quickly implementing San Francisco CARES in December 1999 to meet a June 2000 deadline for sending checks to the first round of recipients. Although Wu Yee initially posted a job announcement for a CARES program director and outreach specialist, these positions went unfilled, and management staff from

Wu Yee ultimately served as interim directors of the program. A full-time CARES coordinator, assisted by two part-time temporary staff, was charged with processing applications, coordinating publicity, conducting outreach, reviewing transcripts, and communicating with an external evaluation team. Together with these paid staff, volunteers who were equally committed to the success of San Francisco CARES were critical to the program's ability to meet its tight deadlines.

Community college instructors were retained on a contract basis to review and evaluate applicants' transcripts. Eighteen members of the San Francisco child care community, many of whom were bilingual, were recruited to be "Corps Program Consultants" and to assist applicants, as well as to serve on Wu Yee's internal advisory committees. These consultants received $400 in exchange for their services, which Wu Yee acknowledges did not fully compensate them for their many hours of service to San Francisco CARES.

Alameda County

The Alameda County Children and Families Commission, which manages Proposition 10 funding for the county, directly administers the Child Development Corps. The director of the Alameda County Child Development Corps, and other early childhood initiatives administered by the Commission, was formerly the child care coordinator for the county. The director oversees the work of a full-time program coordinator, and a consultant who is also the Director of the California Early Childhood Mentor Program. The consultant's duties in this first year of operation, which are ongoing for two days per week through 2000, include:

- Establishing the budget
- Developing an overall work plan and timeline
- Developing the Corps professional development plan
- Developing an administrative structure
- Establishing systems for policy development
- Planning the overall outreach strategy
- Providing initial training of Corps Advisors
- Planning formative and summative evaluation efforts in conjunction with an independent evaluator
- Developing and coordinating the database in conjunction with the independent evaluator
- Presenting the Corps to the child care community.

Thirty-two "Corps Advisors" were employed by the Commission as contractors to help child care teachers, administrators and providers apply for membership in the Corps. As in San Francisco, many advisors were bilingual. In exchange for their service, Corps Advisors received a $500 stipend, which program administrators view as too little for the time and energy these workers expended. Administrators of the Alameda County effort are also considering employing a larger number of Corps Advisors to meet the needs of applicants in subsequent years. Corps Advisors were supervised by the Program Coordinator, who was responsible for providing their training as well as reviewing all applications for the Corps prior to stipend approval.

Applicant Data Base

In the crucial first year of operation, San Francisco CARES and the Alameda County Child Development Corps administrators were interested in learning detailed information about Corps participants, and about how well the program was serving the needs of the community. The application form, in which Corps applicants provide information about their education and employment, offered an important opportunity to gather baseline data about the population of applicants and to evaluate the program's effectiveness. The PACE evaluators, who are conducting an independent assessment of the two programs, also sought to collect data through the application process. The consultant to the Alameda Child Development Corps, working with a database design consultant, designed the application materials and corresponding database used by Alameda and available to San Francisco to track the continued participation of applicants and monitor the program. Alameda Counties' applications were all entered into this common database, allowing PACE to draw from a comparable data source. Funding from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation supported this endeavor. The data base is available for use by any county wishing to conduct a CARES program.

Oversight and Planning Committees

San Francisco CARES and the Alameda County Child Development Corps, as we have seen, have resulted largely from the commitment and actions of community members who drew on the design of the state-level CARES model to advance the cause of improved compensation, training and staff stability. It is not surprising, therefore, that these communities have a large stake in the operation and ultimate successes of these two programs. This desire for community involvement on the part of CARES advocates and administrators has been expressed, particularly in San Francisco, in the formation of committees which have the chance to shape aspects of the program. While the San Francisco program has

benefited from the input of many stakeholders, the committee structure in the first year is a complex one.

In Alameda County, the Early Care and Education (ECE) Prop 10 Subcommittee of the Child Care Planning Council, which was responsible for planning the Corps, determines major policy and program design questions. The ECE Subcommittee made the decision, for example, to require a minimum qualification of 12 early childhood education units to participate in the Corps, rather than lowering the requirement to 6 units. The Subcommittee also determined that the Corps would not prioritize applicants based on income, and that all qualified applicants would receive a stipend even if this required reducing the stipend amounts that applicants would receive. The ECE Subcommittee continues to review the progress of the Corps as well as the other child care-related components of the Alameda County Prop 10 plan, and reports to the Child Care Planning Council.

Just prior to the initiation of the Corps, a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) representing family child care programs, nonprofit, for-profit and subsidized centers, and community colleges, was designated by the ECE Subcommittee as the implementation advisory group. The three child care resource and referral agencies in Alameda County serve as consultants to the TAC. Examples of decisions the TAC has made include considering whether full-time child care teacher substitutes would be eligible for the Child Development Corps, and determining the needed documentation for bonus bilingual stipends. TAC also serves as the Grievance Committee to consider appeals from CARES applicants.

Corps advisors and staff relay policy and program decisions to the county Children and Families Commission, which serves as the final decision-making body for the Corps. Approval must be obtained from the Commission for all significant changes, including modifications to stipend award levels.

The groups advising San Francisco CARES administrators range from an internal set of committees established by Wu Yee Children's Services, to an outside advisory panel of labor and community groups concerned about the outcomes and future of San Francisco CARES. Wu Yee established task-oriented subcommittees, comprised of San Francisco CARES staff, consultants and community members, to expedite policy decisions. Committees were organized around the following topics: publicity, orientation, the application process, and the grievance/appeals process.

The Department of Children, Youth and Their Families (DCYF), the San Francisco funding agency for San Francisco CARES, selected a workgroup of community stakeholders as an advisory committee for the program. The charge of this group is to serve as advisors to DCYF, finalize the appeals process, confirm

final decisions about stipend recipients, process second round appeals (after the contractor has addressed the first round), and address conflict of interest issues.

Another advisory panel to San Francisco CARES is comprised of members of the Child Care Provider's Association, which was instrumental in lobbying for the program. This panel continues to meet regularly to provide guidance to the CARES implementation team, sponsor events such as a legislative breakfast, lobby for additional funds for San Francisco CARES, and continue to influence San Francisco policymakers to address the staffing crisis.

Two groups in San Francisco, whose focus extends beyond San Francisco CARES, are working on closely allied goals and consequently are worthy of mention. The San Francisco Child Care Planning and Advisory Council, a state-mandated body appointed by the Board of Supervisors to coordinate child care services in the county, has developed a joint working committee to develop long-term systemic strategies for increasing wages for child care professionals. The Child Care Organizing Roundtable, comprised of representatives from labor groups, the child care community, inter-faith networks and other community groups, has met on a regular basis since 1999 to build partnerships with the goal of improving child care jobs. Coleman Advocates for Youth has organized this effort in San Francisco, and the Labor Project for Working Families is organizing similar collaborations throughout the Bay Area.

Another major new program to improve child care compensation in San Francisco will also be in effect in year two of San Francisco CARES. Wages Plus, with a $4.1 million allocation for fiscal year 2000-2001, was announced . . . in June 2000 . . .

Another major new program to improve child care compensation in San Francisco will also be in effect in year two of San Francisco CARES. Wages Plus, with a $4.1 million allocation for fiscal year 2000-2001, was announced by Mayor Willie Brown in June 2000, shortly before the first San Francisco CARES stipends were being sent to applicants. The program is distinct from CARES in that it focuses on improving the wages of entry-level staff, and offsetting the "wage compression" that can occur when wage increases reduce the differential between lower-paid and higher-paid staff, when the latter may have higher qualifications and/or more years of experience. To be eligible, staff must be employed in centers serving at least 25 percent children from low-income families. The Department of Human Services, which is responsible for administering the program, views Wages Plus as a complement to CARES that will help a large group of child care workers move toward a more livable wage, regardless of their education or tenure. It is hoped that over time the program will move the child care field toward a standardized wage schedule as well as better working conditions and benefits.

Challenges of Implementing CARES at the County Level

Limited Planning and Implementation Time

San Francisco and Alameda Counties had very little time in which to plan and implement their respective CARES programs. Both had difficulty hiring a sufficient number of staff in their advertised positions, in part because of limited time, and also because of a tight job market for employers. Resources for Retention, a component of the San Francisco CARES initiative that provides funds to centers demonstrating a commitment to improving staff retention, was not implemented because the challenge of launching the stipend program in such a short time period required all of the administering agency's resources. San Francisco CARES and the Alameda Child Development Corps met the majority of their target dates only through the extra effort and overtime hours of staff, consultants and volunteers. Ensuring that checks are mailed on schedule to all recipients remains a worry for both programs. As San Francisco and Alameda County administrators look toward year two of the initiative, they anticipate that they will be more adequately staffed and able to evaluate and weigh decisions that they needed to expedite in the first year.

San Francisco and Alameda Counties had very little time in which to plan and implement their respective CARES programs. Both had difficulty hiring a sufficient number of staff in their advertised positions, in part because of limited time, and also because of a tight job market for employers.

Limited Funding

The successful publicity conducted by San Francisco and Alameda Counties revealed not only that project staff were closely tied to the child care communities in their counties and effective in their outreach, but that there is a tremendous need and demand for stipends in the child care field. San Francisco CARES was able to serve only one-third of the applicants for funds, and Alameda, while promising to serve all eligible applicants, needed to decrease the amount of the first-year stipends it offered by approximately 13 percent. In San Francisco, a complex prioritization system, necessitated by limited funds, required a labor-intensive review of applicant characteristics. Alameda, which is weighing the possibility of implementing a priority system based on income among other factors in year two, because of limited funding, would prefer to offer universal coverage and retain their focus on educational qualifications rather than earnings. Questions persist in both counties about the eligibility of year one applicants for year two funding. While the concept of the Child Development Corps seems contingent on members joining for an extended period of time, giving

priority to year one applicants in the second year may exclude many newcomers to the early care and education field, which could limit the program's effectiveness unless additional funding is identified.

Achieving Family Child Care Involvement

CARES has appealed to many in the child care community because it is an incentive program accessible to all members of the child care workforce, including teachers, directors, and family child care providers. Both San Francisco and Alameda County conducted outreach to the family child care community, and leaders of family child care associations have been prominent members of planning and advisory committees in both communities. Yet San Francisco CARES administrators report that only 94 family child care providers applied for the stipend, and although there were significantly more family child care applicants in Alameda County (200), they still were not represented in proportion to their numbers in the community. The low response of family child care providers is still under review, but one possible explanation is that providers typically have completed less formal education at the college level than have center teaching and administrative staff. Some have recommended that providers' years of experience be recognized and rewarded, but others who view the CARES initiative as a professional development reward system are uncomfortable with establishing alternative criteria for family child care providers.

Verifying Transcripts and Other Documents

CARES administrators in San Francisco and Alameda Counties sought to achieve a balance between verifying past employment and education and creating an accessible application process. As the first community to implement a CARES application process, San Francisco encountered and responded to a number of complications in evaluating applications. Original transcripts, for example, which were a San Francisco CARES requirement, in some cases did not arrive by the required timeline, which resulted in the need to establish an appeals procedure. Inconsistencies between employer letters verifying employment and applicants' self reports required time-consuming additional verification. Confronted with foreign transcripts and work experience, San Francisco CARES had to quickly establish a policy to require an equivalency review by a foreign transcript evaluator for educational records, and to disregard foreign work experience because of the lack of comparability. The foreign transcript evaluator's fee, which was between $300 and $400 per application, was not affordable for some applicants. San Francisco CARES' funder, DCYF, is seeking funds to assist applicants in paying for translations in year 2.

Alameda County also experienced challenges in reviewing and accepting foreign transcripts. BANANAS, one of Alameda County's three resource and referral agencies, provided detailed information on approved transcript translation agencies and obtained funding for a limited number of applicants who required their services. Although Alameda's challenge of translating applications was mitigated somewhat by this assistance in 2000, additional preparation and funding for translations should be obtained in subsequent years.

Challenges of Proposition 10 Funding: Zero-to-Five Focus, and Communicating with Health Care Professionals

Two challenges for CARES programs are by-products of the Proposition 10 funding process, namely the funding's restriction to services for children ages 0-5, and the need for child development representatives to elicit support for CARES from health care and other professionals who may be unfamiliar with the consequences of low compensation in the child care field.

Although school-age care programs must also contend with low wages and staff instability, which some suggest may be even higher than in child care centers, they are ineligible to participate in CARES programs, such as Alameda County's, that are funded exclusively with Prop 10 dollars. Alameda County Child Development Corps administrators are seeking to identify sources of unrestricted funding in order to extend the benefits of CARES to caregivers and administrators in school-age programs. San Francisco CARES was able to serve caregivers in school-age programs with unrestricted county funding, but administrators are mindful of the possible complications of adding Proposition 10 funding in subsequent years to a program that targets the full range of the child care workforce.

Proposition 10 commissions are typically comprised of members of the child health, mental health, parent services and child care/child development fields, as well as unrelated fields such as business, public relations, law and finance. Not surprisingly, members of these various professional groups often lack comprehensive knowledge of the issues facing their fellow commissioners and the communities they represent. While many child care advocates have come to understand that improved compensation is a necessary precondition of child care quality, the relationship between higher wages and better services and outcomes for young children is not widely enough understood outside of this field.

In Alameda County, CARES supporters spent considerable time developing a collaboration between disciplines, educating commissioners about the value of a CARES initiative with the aid of published research findings, and, in turn, learning about the concerns of other commissioners in order to identify the possible overlap in funding priorities. Some elements of Alameda County's

broader Proposition 10 plan cross disciplines; home health care visiting, for example, is followed up in a child's center or family child care home, with consultation available to the child care facility if desired. Such collaboration was ultimately critical to gaining broad support across disciplines for the Child Development Corps.

Looking Ahead to the Future Of CARES

At this writing, San Francisco CARES and the Alameda County Child Development Corps are planning for year two of their initiatives. In San Francisco, the program's supporters are intent on expanding CARES to meet the needs of more members of the child care workforce. The proposed city budget for San Francisco CARES 2001 is $1.5 million, a small increase over the $1.15 million allocation of the previous year, and Proposition 10 funds are a new possible source of additional support. Supporters anticipate that recipients of San Francisco CARES stipends, as well as applicants who were eligible but did not receive funds, will lend their voices to advocating for an expansion of the initiative.

WAGES Plus, described earlier, will undoubtedly have a major impact on child care salaries in San Francisco. Administrators are committed to coordinating the implementation of these programs to better serve San Francisco's child care workforce. Resources for Retention, a program providing grants to centers implementing staff retention plans, will be implemented in San Francisco in the second year of CARES.

The Alameda County Child Development Corps is currently funded at $3.8 million dollars through June 2001. Following the disbursal of stipends to 2,399 Child Development Corps members in September, the initiative is planning a series of three trainings to help members meet their ongoing professional development requirements that will qualify them to apply for year-two membership. Each Corps member will attend one event, and have the opportunity to come together in group and individual activities.

Encouraged by Alameda's and San Francisco's successes, a number of Bay Area Counties are advocating for and developing CARES programs of their own. Most of these counties are pursuing Proposition 10 dollars, with some measure of success. Counties that have developed a plan include Marin and San Mateo. Contra Costa, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara Counties are advocating for CARES and working in their communities to translate the needs of child care programs, administrators and caregivers into a blueprint for the program. While support for CARES is strong in most of these communities among child care center directors, teachers, family child care providers and parents, some Prop 10 Commissions have recommended very limited funding for the initiative; one county,

Although Alameda, San Francisco and other counties' CARES programs hold out tremendous promise, the long-term impact and future of the programs remain in question.

San Mateo, has placed a cap on funds earmarked for CARES. County Commissions' move toward diverting Prop 10 funds into large long-term endowments further complicates CARES supporters' efforts to identify local sources of support.

Although Alameda, San Francisco and other counties' CARES programs hold out tremendous promise, the long-term impact and future of the programs remain in question. It is unclear, for example, how long the City and County of San Francisco or the Alameda County Proposition 10 Commission will choose to make funding a CARES initiative a priority, and as demand for the program is likely to grow, it will be more difficult to prioritize funding to specific groups of applicants if the program is funded at the current level. Learning more about the outcomes of the CARES initiatives through the PACE and other evaluations will provide important information about the viability of the program, and about areas for revision and improvement. The influence of state funds to support staff retention efforts on behalf of state-subsidized programs provides a significant source of funding which may take a variety of forms in different communities. It remains certain, however, that without improved compensation, members of the child care workforce will continue to leave their jobs, and it will become increasingly difficult to attract qualified staff to take their places. While CARES may not be the ultimate solution to this problem, it appear to be the best that we have now, and it holds the seeds of future approaches to improving child care jobs.

Reflections on the CARES Experiment, 1997–2000

Since a substantial investment of resources, most likely from a combination of local, state and federal sources, will be necessary to adequately compensate the child care workforce, advocates recognize that making far-reaching, systemic improvements in child care earnings is a long-term endeavor. Indeed, many of those who are currently working on CARES or similar initiatives in their communities have been working toward improving child care jobs for a decade, two decades, or more. The experience of other professional groups is instructive: kindergarten teachers, for example, struggled for a century before achieving comparability with teachers of older children. Efforts such as CARES are a first step in the longer struggle for systematic change to reward members of the child care workforce and recognize their educational investments. They represent a way of ameliorating the worst effects of low compensation—high turnover and poorly-trained staff—while helping to build more effective coalitions of people committed to change.

Efforts such as CARES are a first step in the longer struggle for systematic change to reward members of the child care workforce and recognize their educational investments. They represent a way of ameliorating the worst effects of low compensation . . . while helping to build more effective coalitions of people committed to change.

This account of the effort to bring CARES to California, and later to San Francisco and Alameda Counties, suggests a number of observations:

- Success does not occur overnight, but reflects hard work and long-term commitment from advocates who are dedicated to improving wages and professional development opportunities for the child care workforce.
- Strong community organizations, as well as child care leaders that grasp the staffing crisis, are the cornerstone of implementing CARES-

type programs. The advocacy efforts launched in San Francisco and Alameda were strengthened by the credibility of the leaders within the communities that they represent. Some leaders and organizations had been engaged in related efforts for more than twenty years, which provided extremely valuable groundwork for CARES advocacy and planning.

- Policymaking follows unexpected paths. California CARES, which few expected to receive bipartisan support, sailed through the legislature, only to encounter an executive veto, and ultimately was radically revised in order to secure the Governor's support. Although CARES was originally envisioned as a state initiative, the willingness of a local government and a county Proposition 10 Commission to fund the model led to local implementation first. Events have intervened to create both opportunities and setbacks, far beyond the control or imagination of CARES supporters.
- An identified funding stream can make or break a program. Local Proposition 10 funding, a new source targeted toward services for children 0-5, created new opportunities to fund local programs, even in communities that had not had a history of compensation advocacy. The absence of a targeted funding stream at the state level forced the program, which was embraced by the legislature, to struggle for gubernatorial approval.
- A clearly stated program design helps to facilitate local and statewide advocacy. The presence of a bold and detailed vision, such as was articulated in the California CARES legislation, can free advocates, activists and sympathetic policymakers to call for change, without having to take on the often cumbersome process of policy design. In this case, it has also allowed communities to share public education materials and learn from each other's experiences.
- The implementation of various models of a similar program helps to identify strengths and weaknesses, and creates an important knowledge base, if there is adequate communication among communities. Even when guided by a public policy initiative template, as was true in San Francisco and Alameda County, local program planners and administrators have shaped the program for the needs of their communities as they understand them, and will undoubtedly continue to do so over time. The existence initially of a statewide network involved

in the legislative process, and then the creation of a local network of counties interested in the CARES model, helped local groups to grapple with the pros and cons of various approaches and to learn from one another.

Because this report is simply a snapshot in time, as we have indicated, this list should be viewed as a work in progress that will grow as experience with CARES continues.

Appendices: San Francisco and Alameda County Application Materials

San Francisco CARES Program

Application Guidelines

Purpose

The San Francisco CARES (Compensation and Retention Encourage Stability) program will provide financial incentives through distribution of stipends to encourage child care teachers and providers to stay in the field and further their education. The program is designed to promote the retention of stable, committed, qualified child care teachers and providers to ensure quality services to children in care. The San Francisco CARES is a program of Wu Yee Children's Services and is funded by the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families. The program is being developed with the leadership of the San Francisco Child Care Provider's Association and support from the child care community.

Stipend Amounts

Stipend amounts range from $500 to $5,000, with additional amounts of $500 each for those possessing a graduate degree, or fluent in at least one language (this includes Sign Language) other than English, and use it on the job with children, parents, and staff who speak that language.

Submission information

Please type or print (in ink) all information legibly. All illegible or incomplete applications will not be processed. In addition, while applications will be available in English, Chinese and Spanish, *all answers and supporting documents must be in English.* Technical and language assistance is available. If you need help filling out the form please refer to the Corps Program Consultant list enclosed (or call 415-677-0100 x47 for English, x48 for Chinese, x49 for Spanish).

All applications must be received by 5 p.m. on Monday, May 1, 2000 at the following address. Hand delivery accepted. Include self-addressed stamped post card if you would like a receipt.

Wu Yee Children's Services
888 Clay Street
San Francisco, CA 94108
Attn.: CARES Applications

Application submission should include all of the following *with the supporting documentation:*

1. **Application/Eligibility**
2. **Application/Stipend Amount**
3. **Employment History and Verification**
4. **Education History and Verification**

Mail your applications in early. *Late applications will not be processed.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Wu Yee Children's Services

Application/Eligibility

Office use only
Application no. _____

Applicant Information

1. *Name* _____ 2. *Home telephone no.* _____

3. *Address* _____ 4. *Zip Code* _____ 5. *Work telephone no.* _____

I certify that all information and documentation provided is true and correct. I understand that any falsification of information may result in my returning all monies with penalties to the program. I further understand that before any monies are paid to me, I will be required to provide additional information and documents to the program.

Signature _____ *Date signed* _____

Optional—for research purposes only:

6. *Gender:* a ❑ *female* b ❑ *male* 7. *Date of birth:* _____ 8. *Ethnicity:* _____

Child Care Facility Information

9. *Name of child care facility* _____

10. *Site address* _____ 11. *Zip Code* _____

12. *Mailing address* _____ 13. *Zip Code* _____

14. *Director's name or Family Child Care Licensee's name* _____ 15. *Telephone no.* _____

16. *License no. (Posted in your facility)* _____ 17. *Type of facility:* a ❑ *Center* b ❑ *Family Child Care*

Eligibility

You are eligible to apply if you can answer yes to the next four statements.

Yes (1) *No* (0)

18. I am currently employed as (check one of the following)
   a. ❑ A child care assistant (this includes paraprofessional, leader, aide, etc.)
   b. ❑ An associate teacher
   c. ❑ A teacher
   d. ❑ A site supervisor
   e. ❑ A director
   f. ❑ A family child care provider

19. I have worked in the City of San Francisco in the same facility licensed by Community Care Licensing for a period of at least one year since May 1, 1999. (The applicant must have worked a minimum 3 hours a day for 175 days out of the year.)

20. I care for at least three children.

21. I have a minimum of 6 Early Childhood Education (ECE), Child Development (CDEV) units, or 6 units toward a Family Child Care Certificate. The units are at college level and have a passing grade of C or better.

22. I am not eligible at this time, but may be eligible in the future. I have completed the Application/Eligibility and Stipend Amount (this page and the reverse, pg. 1 and 2 of the application) and sent it in to keep me on the mailing list.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Application/Stipend Amount

Section A *(check only one):*
This applies to your educational qualifications, not your current position. See Education History and Verification page for further description of educational qualifications.

23. ☐ **Level 1** Qualifies as Associate or Assistant Teacher (this includes paraprofessional, leader, aide, etc.) who has completed at least six units of Early Childhood Education, Child Development, or 6 units toward a Family Child Care Certificate ($500)

24. ☐ **Level 2A** Qualifies as Teacher who meets the requirements of the Child Development Permit Matrix ($1,500)

25. ☐ **Level 2B** Qualifies as Master Teacher, Site Supervisor or Program Director of the Child Development Permit Matrix and does *not* hold a bachelor's degree ($2,500)

26. ☐ **Level 2C** Qualifies as Master Teacher, Site Supervisor or Program Director of the Child Development Permit Matrix and holds a bachelor's degree ($5,000)

Section B *(check any applicable):*

27. ☐ Possesses master's or graduate degree ($500)

28. ☐ Fluent in at least one language (this includes Sign Language) in addition to English, and use it on the job with children, parents, or staff who speak that language. Language: _____ ($500)
29.

Total amount of stipend requested $ _____ ***(write full stipend amount here)***
30.

Full stipend amount will go to those currently working 30 hours/week.
Half stipend will go to those working less than 30 hours/week.

Office use only
Application no. _____

Employment History and Verification

(For up to 15 years)

Verification of current income and employment must be in a letter on agency letterhead of current employer (or for Family Child Care on letter with FCC license) signed by the director of the program or member of the board of directors, and must include the following information. *Please use enclosed letter form to copy onto or attach to agency letterhead (English only).*

- Name and current position of applicant
- Current number of hours applicant works per week
- Number of years applicant has held current position
- Number of years applicant has held other child care positions within the organization
- Current hourly rate of pay, exclusive of benefits
- Language spoken fluently (including sign language) other than English, and spoken by children, parents, and staff on the job
- Name, title and telephone number of person writing letter

Only the following documents will be accepted as verification of employment relevant to the child care field.

For employees of a licensed child development center or family child care home:

A. Employment verification letter on agency letterhead (or for Family Child Care on letter with FCC license on it) signed by director of program or member of board of directors.

—OR—

B. W-2 (for *past employers only* when you can not obtain a letter of verification)

For Family Child Care licensees:

C. FCC license *and* 1099 or tax return including Schedule SE (1999 tax year and previous tax years)

—OR—

D. FCC license *and* service verification letter on agency letterhead signed by Family Child Care Network director.

Employment Record

Please list in order of current position first and attach supporting documents.

Name of child care facility	*City*	*License #*	*Dates*	*Years*	*Verification method* (Check one box, see description above)			
Current 35.		36.			❑ *Verification letter*			
Positions 31.								
32. *1.*					❑ *FCC license & verification letter*			
33. *2.*								
34. *3.*					❑ *FCC license & 1099 (tax return)*			
			Total years →	37.	*Letter*	*W-2*	*License & 1099*	*License & letter*
Past in SF 38. *1.*				39.	❑	❑	❑	❑
40. *2.*				41.	❑	❑	❑	❑
			Total years →	42.				
Past outside SF 43. *1.*				44.	❑	❑	❑	❑
45. *2.*				46.	❑	❑	❑	❑
			Total years →	47.				

Attach additional sheets as necessary.

Education History and Verification

Section A *(check only one)*:
This applies to your educational qualifications, not your current position.

Check one verification form.
If using Child Development Permit, no transcript needed. Official transcripts may be sent directly to Wu Yee Children's Services.

Level 1

48. ❑ Assistant or Associate Teacher or Family Child Care provider ($500)—I have completed at least:

6 units of Early Childhood Education (ECE), Child Development (CDEV), or 6 units toward an FCC certificate
—OR—
an accredited HERO program (including ROP).

Level 1
- ❑ Child Development Permit
- ❑ Official Transcript
- ❑ CC Licensing form showing valid signature

Level 2A

49. ❑ Teacher ($1,500)—I have completed:

24 units of ECE or CDEV including core courses, 16 general education units
—OR—
an AA or higher in ECE or related field with 3 semester units supervised field experience in ECE setting, or for Family Child Care, two years running a program without serious substantiated licensing violations.

Level 2A
- ❑ Child Development Permit
- ❑ Official Transcript
- ❑ CC Licensing form showing valid signature

Level 2B

50. ❑ Master Teacher, Site Supervisor or Program Director ($2,500)—I have completed:

24 units of ECE or CDEV including core courses, 16 general education units, 6 specialized units, and 2 adult supervision units
—OR—
an AA (or 60 units) with 24 ECE or CDEV units, including core units, 6 units of administration, and 2 adult supervision units
—OR—
a Teaching or Administration credential with 12 ECE units, including core units, and 3 units supervised field experience in ECE setting or for Family Child Care, two years running a program without serious substantiated licensing violations.

Level 2B
- ❑ Child Development Permit
- ❑ Official Transcript

Level 2C

51. ❑ Master Teacher, Site Supervisor or Program Director with Bachelor's Degree ($5,000) – I have completed:

a BA with 12 units of ECE, 3 units supervised field experience in ECE setting or for Family Child Care, two years running a program without serious substantiated licensing violations
—OR—
a BA with 24 units of ECE or CDEV including core units, 6 units administration, and 2 units adult supervision.

Level 2C
- ❑ Child Development Permit
- ❑ Official Transcript

Section B *(check any applicable **and** attach transcript for graduate degree, or letter on letterhead from your current site, signed by director or board for other language)*:

Section B

52. ❑ I have a master's (or graduate) degree (an additional $500).

- ❑ Official Transcript

53. ❑ I am fluent in at least one language (this includes Sign Language) other than English, and use it in my job with children, parents, and staff who speak that language (an additional $500). Language: _____

- ❑ Letter on letterhead

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Priority for Distribution of Stipends

If the CARES funding appropriation is insufficient, priority for funding shall go to those earning below the amounts* specified below:

First priority for Level One Stipends shall be granted to any Associate or Assistant Teacher who earns less than $10 an hour, exclusive of benefits.

First priority for Level Two stipends shall be granted to individuals who are qualified for the following levels of the Child Development Permit and who earn less than the following hourly wages, exclusive of benefits:

1. Teacher earning less than $15 per hour
2. Master Teacher earning less than $18 per hour
3. Site Supervisors earning less than $21 per hour
4. Program Directors earning less than $24 per hour

**The Advisory Committee will reassess these wage amounts annually.*

Additional priority for distribution of stipends will be determined based on point system considering the following factors:

1. Time spent in program (50%)
2. Time worked in San Francisco (30%)
3. Time spent in field (15%)
4. Participation in Child Development Corps Meeting in previous year (5%)—only relevant after first year of program

How the point system will work:

Years	*Points*
15+	10
12–14	9
10–11	8
8–9	7
6–7	6
5	5
4	4
3	3
2	2
1	1

Example of scoring using the matrix

Applicant A has worked at XYZ center in San Francisco for the past year. Before that A worked at other centers in San Francisco for four years. A has worked in child care both in and out of San Francisco for a total of seven years. A went to both Child Development Corps meetings during A's first year in the program. Applicant A's point ranking is shown below.

Applicant B has worked at ABC center in San Francisco for the past five years. This was B's first job in the city so B's total years in San Francisco is also five. B worked in child care in other areas for three years before starting the job in San Francisco, totaling eight years in the field. This is the first year of the program so there were no Child Development meetings for B to attend so no points were awarded for meeting attendance. Applicant B's point ranking is shown below.

Applicant B is the likely candidate for the program.

Example of scoring using the matrix

Criteria	*Applicant A*		*Applicant B*	
Time in program	(1 yr) 1 pt x 50%	= 0.50	(5 yrs) 5 pts x 50%	= 2.50
Time worked in S.F.	(5 yrs) 5 pts x 30%	= 1.50	(5 yrs) 5 pts x 30%	= 1.50
Time in child care field	(7 yrs) 6 pts x 15%	= 1.05	(8 yrs) 7 pts x 15%	= 1.20
Meeting attendance	2 meetings x 5%	= 0.10	0 x 5%	= 0
TOTAL		= 3.15		= 5.20

Employment History and Verification Letter—Past Employment

Please copy onto or attach to agency letterhead, or if Family Child Care, send with Family Child Care license number on letter form.

Date: _____

To the SF CARES program:

_____ (applicant's name) worked as a(n) _____ (65. current position) for _____ (66. no.) years and _____ (no.) months. S/He worked _____ (67. no.) hours per week. Before holding this position with us, _____ (applicant's name) worked as a(n) _____ (68. position) and a(n) _____ (69. position) in this program. _____ (applicant's name) worked for us for _____ (70. no.) years and _____ (no.) months. _____ (applicant's name)'s hourly wage started at _____ (71. dollar amt.) in _____ (72. year) and ended at _____ (73. dollar amt.) in _____ (74. year).

I am _____ (75. author's name) and write to you as the _____ (76. author's title) of the program at _____ (77. name of facility)

I can be reached at _____ (author's phone no.) for further information.

Please add any additional comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

Sincerely,

Employment History and Verification Letter—Current Employment

Please copy onto or attach to agency letterhead, or if Family Child Care, send with Family Child Care license number on letter form.

Date: _____

To the SF CARES program:

_____ (54. applicant's name) has worked as a(n) _____ (55. current position) for the past _____ (56. no.) years and _____ (no.) months. S/He works for _____ (57. no.) hours per week. Before holding this position with us, _____ (applicant's name) worked as a(n) _____ (58. past position) and a(n) _____ (59. past position) in this program. Before her/his current position and not including the years and months of his/her current position, _____ (applicant's name) worked for us for _____ (60. no.) years and _____ (no.) months. _____ (applicant's name)'s current hourly wage is _____ (61. dollar amt.). S/He speaks _____ (62. language) fluently and uses this language with children, parents, and staff (and so helps these staff members to communicate with others in the program) to support our program.

I am _____ (63. author's name) and write to you as the _____ (64. author's title) of the program at _____ (name of facility). I can be reached at _____ (author's phone no.) for further information.

Please add any additional comments: _____

Alameda County Every Child Counts Program

Child Development Corps Year 2000 Application

Center Staff, Center Directors & *Staff* in Family Child Care Homes

Welcome to the Alameda County Child Development Corps Funded by Proposition 10!
Apply for Membership and a Stipend if You:

- Work as an early childhood educator (in a center or family child care) with children ages birth to five
- Have worked at least half time (20 hours per week) in the same child care program in Alameda County for at least 9 months prior to July 1, 2000.
- Have completed a minimum of 12 units of Early Childhood Education

Participation in the Corps is voluntary. If you meet the above criteria, please continue!

INSTRUCTIONS

- Please type or print (in ink) all information legibly. Complete all requested information in **Sections 1** and **3**.
- Have your Director complete and sign **Section 2-A**.
- **Meet with a Corps Advisor to review your application and verify your educational level.** Contact information for Corps Advisors is attached to this application.
  You must bring copies of transcripts or your Child Development Permit to your meeting with a Corps Advisor so that she/he may review and sign off the documents.
- If you are a Director applying for a stipend, you must complete **Section 2-B** *and bring the supporting employment documentation to your meeting with a Corps Advisor.*
- Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Don't forget to sign your application on page 3!
- Applications must be completed (including all necessary documentation) and presented to a Corps Advisor before **5:00 PM, Friday June 30th**. Please call 510-667-7451 with any questions.

SECTION 1

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	MID. INITIAL

IS THIS THE NAME ON THE **BIRTH CERTIFICATE**? ☐YES ☐NO IF NO, WHAT IS THE NAME ON THE BIRTH CERTIFICATE?

BIRTH LAST NAME	BIRTH FIRST NAME	MID. INITIAL

HOME ADDRESS	APT.	CITY	STATE	ZIP

HOME PHONE	WORK PHONE	CELL PHONE	OTHER/MESSAGE PHONE

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (CO. STATE, OR COUNTRY)	GENDER ☐F ☐M	MOTHER'S FIRST NAME	SSN

PLEASE ANSWER BOTH QUESTIONS. THIS INFORMATION IS BEING COLLECTED FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY. CATEGORIES ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE 2000 U.S. CENSUS.

ARE YOU SPANISH/HISPANIC/LATINO?

- ❑ NO
- ❑ YES, MEXICAN, MEXICAN-AM., CHICANO
- ❑ YES, PUERTO RICAN
- ❑ YES, CUBAN
- ❑ YES, OTHER: _____

HOW DO YOU IDENTIFY YOUR RACE/ETHNICITY?
(YOU MAY CHOOSE UP TO 3 CATEGORIES)

- ❑ WHITE
- ❑ BLACK, AFRICAN AMERICAN
- ❑ AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE
- ❑ ASIAN INDIAN
- ❑ CHINESE ❑ FILIPINO
- ❑ KOREAN ❑ VIETNAMESE
- ❑ JAPANESE
- ❑ OTHER ASIAN: _____
- ❑ NATIVE HAWAIIAN
- ❑ GUAMANIAN OR CHAMORRO
- ❑ SAMOAN
- ❑ OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER: _____
- ❑ OTHER RACE: _____

LANGUAGES (INCLUDING SIGN LANGUAGE), OTHER THAN ENGLISH THAT YOU SPEAK FLUENTLY AND USE TO COMMUNICATE WITH CHILDREN, FAMILIES OR STAFF AT WORK

CHILD CARE PROGRAM FOR WHICH YOU WORK

DATES OF EMPLOYMENT FROM _____ (MONTH) _____ (YEAR) TO _____ (MONTH) _____ (YEAR) HOURS WORKED WEEKLY _____

AGES OF CHILDREN YOU WORK WITH (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
❒ BIRTH TO 23MO'S ❒ 2YRS TO 2YRS;11MO'S ❒ 3YRS TO 5YRS

WORK ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP

DIRECTOR'S / FCC LICENSEE'S LAST NAME	DIRECTOR'S / FCC LICENSEE'S FIRST NAME	DIRECTOR / FCC PHONE NUMBER

YOUR **GROSS ANNUAL SALARY** (EXCLUSIVE OF BENEFITS) $_____ *(INCOME INFO FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY)*

YOUR **HOURLY WAGE** (EXCLUSIVE OF BENEFITS) $_____ *(INCOME INFO FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY)*

SECTION 2-A TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT'S DIRECTOR OR FAMILY CHILD CARE LICENSEE

I CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE EMPLOYEE, _____, HAS WORKED AT LEAST HALFTIME (20 HOURS PER WEEK) FOR AT LEAST 9 MONTHS PRIOR TO JULY 1, 2000 AT _____ (CHILD CARE PROGRAM) AND TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE ALAMEDA COUNTY CHILD DEVELOPMENT CORPS.

THE APPLICANT'S CURRENT HOURLY WAGE IS $_____. I UNDERSTAND THAT THE INCENTIVE SHE/HE RECEIVES IS IN ADDITION TO HIS/HER ANNUAL SALARY, AND I CERTIFY THAT CURRENT SALARY AND SALARY ADVANCEMENT WIILL NOT BE NEGATIVELY AFFECTED BY THE INCENTIVE.

ADDITIONALLY, I CERTIFY THAT THIS EMPLOYEE FLUENTLY SPEAKS _____ LANGUAGE, (INCLUDING SIGN LANGUAGE/OTHER THAN ENGLISH), AND USES IT TO COMMUNICATE WITH CHILDREN, PARENTS OR STAFF WHO SPEAK THAT LANGUAGE.

_____ _____
SIGNATURE OF DIRECTOR OR FAMILY CHILD CARE LICENSEE **DATE**

SECTION 2-B TO BE COMPLETED IF DIRECTOR IS THE APPLICANT

DIRECTORS WHO ARE APPLICANTS MUST PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION THAT THEY HAVE DIRECTED THE SAME CHILD CARE PROGRAM IN ALAMEDA COUNTY AT LEAST HALF TIME (20 HOURS PER WEEK) FOR AT LEAST 9 MONTHS PRIOR TO JULY 1, 2000. IF THE PROGRAM IS LICENSED, A COPY OF THE CURRENT LICENSE MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE DOCUMENTATION. IN ADDITION, DIRECTOR APPLICANTS MUST PROVIDE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

❒ BOARD OF DIRECTORS' STATEMENT (NON-PROFIT) ❒ OWNER'S STATEMENT (FOR-PROFIT)
❒ TAX FORM-PREVIOUS YEAR (OWNER-OPERATOR) ❒ COLLEGE OFFICIAL'S STATEMENT (CAMPUS PROGRAM)

NOTE: STATEMENTS MUST BE ON LETTERHEAD AND CONTAIN THE INFORMATION REQUESTED IN SECTION 2-A.

LANGUAGE DECLARATION:

I CERTIFY THAT I FLUENTLY SPEAK _____ LANGUAGE (INCLUDING SIGN LANGUAGE AND OTHER THAN ENGLISH) AND USE THIS LANGUAGE TO COMMUNICATE WITH CHILDREN, FAMILIES OR STAFF IN MY PROGRAM. I AGREE TO PROVIDE FURTHER DOCUMENTATION OF THIS LANGUAGE ABILITY IF REQUESTED TO DO SO.

_____ _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT (DIRECTOR) **DATE**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section 3

Part A (Check the box next to the highest level for which you qualify)

Important Note: Your current job title does **not** determine your stipend. Your **education level** determines your Corps stipend level and tier. Position titles in parentheses apply to corresponding levels of the Child Development Permit Matrix.

LEVEL 1

- ❑ TIER 1: $500 MAXIMUM (ASSOCIATE TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 12 UNITS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (ECE) OR CHILD DEVELOPMENT (CD)
- ❑ TIER 2: $750 MAXIMUM (ASSOCIATE TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 18 UNITS OF ECE OR CD
- ❑ TIER 3: $1000 MAXIMUM (ASSOCIATE TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE OR CD
- ❑ TIER 4: $1250 MAXIMUM (ASSOCIATE TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE OR CD *AND* 8 UNITS OF GENERAL EDUCATION (GE)

LEVEL 2

- ❑ TIER 1: $1500 MAXIMUM (TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE OR CD *AND* 16 UNITS OF GE
- ❑ TIER 2: $2500 MAXIMUM (MASTER TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE /CD *AND* 16 UNITS OF GENERAL EDUCATION (GE), *AND*
  6 UNITS SPECIALIZATION
  2 UNITS ADULT SUPERVISION
  OR (SITE SUPERVISOR)
  AA DEGREE WITH 24 UNITS ECE/CD
  6 UNITS ADMINISTRATION
  2 UNITS ADULT SUPERVISION
- ❑ TIER 3: $6000 MAXIMUM (PROGRAM DIRECTOR)
  I HAVE COMPLETED A BA WITH AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE/CD *AND*
  6 UNITS ADMINISTRATION
  2 UNITS ADULT SUPERVISION

Part B (Check any applicable)

- ❑ GRADUATE DEGREE: ADDITIONAL $500 MAXIMUM
  I HAVE A **MASTER'S DEGREE OR HIGHER.**
- ❑ BILINGUAL: ADDITIONAL $500 MAXIMUM
  I AM FLUENT IN AT LEAST ONE LANGUAGE (INCLUDING SIGN LANGUAGE) **IN ADDITION** TO ENGLISH, **AND USE IT IN MY JOB** WITH CHILDREN, PARENTS, OR STAFF WHO SPEAK THAT LANGUAGE.

If you present a copy of your Child Development Permit, no transcripts are needed.

Applicants who wish to qualify under the Alternative Qualifications of the Child Development Permit Matrix may submit the required documentation (please refer to a Child Development Permit Matrix).

FOR CORPS ADVISOR'S USE ONLY:

I HAVE VERIFIED THAT THE APPLICANT QUALIFIES FOR THE FOLLOWING CORPS STIPEND:

- ❑ L1-T1
- ❑ L1-T2
- ❑ L1-T3
- ❑ L1-T4
- ❑ L2-T1
- ❑ L2-T2
- ❑ L2-T3

CHOOSE ONLY ONE

- ❑ GRADUATE DEGREE
- ❑ BILINGUAL

IN MAKING THIS DETERMINATION, I REVIEWED THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTATION:

- ❑ DIRECTOR'S/FAMILY CC LICENSEE STATEMENT (SECTION 2)
- ❑ COLLEGE TRANSCRIPTS
- ❑ CHILD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

DOCUMENTATION OF EMPLOYMENT FOR DIRECTORS WHO ARE APPLICANTS:

- ❑ LICENSE (ALL LICENSED PROGRAMS)
- ❑ BOARD OF DIRECTORS' STATEMENT (NON- PROFIT)
- ❑ OWNER'S STATEMENT (FOR-PROFIT)
- ❑ TAX FORM-PREVIOUS YEAR (OWNER-OPERATOR)
- ❑ COLLEGE OFFICIAL'S STATEMENT (CAMPUS PROGRAM)
- ❑ OTHER: _____

_____
SIGNATURE OF CORPS ADVISOR

DATE: _____

I CERTIFY THAT ALL INFORMATION PROVIDED IS TRUE AND CORRECT, INCLUDING THE LANGUAGE DECLARATION IN PART B.

_____ _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT DATE

Alameda County Every Child Counts Program

Child Development Corps Year 2000 Application

Family Child Care Licensees

Welcome to the Alameda County Child Development Corps Funded by Proposition 10!
Apply for Membership and a Stipend if you:

- Have a Family Child Care License and work with children ages birth to five
- Have provided child care at least half time (20 hours per week) in the same child care program in Alameda County for at least 9 months prior to July 1, 2000
- Have completed a minimum of 12 units of Early Childhood Education

Participation in the Corps is voluntary. If you meet the above criteria, please continue!

INSTRUCTIONS

- Please type or print (in ink) all information legibly. Complete all requested information in **Sections 1, 2-A, 2-B** and **3**.
- **Meet with a Corps Advisor to review your application and verify your educational level.** Contact information for Corps Advisors is attached to this application.
  You must bring copies of transcripts or your Child Development Permit to your meeting with a Corps Advisor so that she/he may review and sign off the documents.
- Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Don't forget to sign your application on page 3!
- Applications must be completed (including all necessary documentation) and presented to a Corps Advisor before **5:00 PM, Friday, June 30th**. Please call 510-667-7451 with any questions.

SECTION 1

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	MID. INITIAL

IS THIS THE NAME ON THE **BIRTH CERTIFICATE**? ☐YES ☐NO IF NO, WHAT IS THE NAME ON THE BIRTH CERTIFICATE?

BIRTH LAST NAME	BIRTH FIRST NAME	MID. INITIAL

HOME ADDRESS	APT.	CITY	STATE	ZIP

HOME PHONE	WORK PHONE	CELL PHONE	OTHER PHONE

DATE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF BIRTH (CO. STATE, OR COUNTRY)	GENDER ☐F ☐M	MOTHER'S FIRST NAME	SSN

PLEASE ANSWER BOTH QUESTIONS. THIS INFORMATION IS BEING COLLECTED FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY. CATEGORIES ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE 2000 U.S. CENSUS.

ARE YOU SPANISH/HISPANIC/LATINO?

- ❑ NO
- ❑ YES, MEXICAN, MEXICAN-AM., CHICANO
- ❑ YES, PUERTO RICAN
- ❑ YES, CUBAN
- ❑ YES, OTHER: _____

HOW DO YOU IDENTIFY YOUR RACE/ETHNICITY?
(YOU MAY CHOOSE UP TO 3 CATEGORIES)

- ❑ WHITE
- ❑ BLACK, AFRICAN AMERICAN
- ❑ AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE
- ❑ ASIAN INDIAN
- ❑ CHINESE ❑ FILIPINO
- ❑ KOREAN ❑ VIETNAMESE
- ❑ JAPANESE
- ❑ OTHER ASIAN: _____
- ❑ NATIVE HAWAIIAN
- ❑ GUAMANIAN OR CHAMORRO
- ❑ SAMOAN
- ❑ OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER: _____
- ❑ OTHER RACE: _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LANGUAGES (INCLUDING SIGN LANGUAGE), OTHER THAN ENGLISH YOU SPEAK FLUENTLY AND USE TO COMMUNICATE WITH CHILDREN, FAMILIES OR STAFF IN YOUR PROGRAM
FCC NAME FCC LICENSE #
NUMBER OF CHILDREN YOU ARE LICENSED TO SERVE
NUMBER OF CHILDREN YOU CURRENTLY SERVE, BY AGES: 6WKS TO 23MO'S: 2YRS TO 2YRS;11MO'S: 3YRS TO 5YRS:
YOUR NET INCOME WAS, FOR 1999 (1099 SCHEDULE SE - *INCOME INFO FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY*) $

SECTION 2-A [redacted]

PROGRAM VERIFICATION:

FAMILY CHILD CARE LICENSEES MUST PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION THAT THEY HAVE OPERATED THE SAME FAMILY CHILD CARE PROGRAM IN ALAMEDA COUNTY AT LEAST HALF TIME (20 HRS. PER WEEK) FOR AT LEAST 9 MONTHS PRIOR TO JULY 1, 2000. A COPY OF THE CURRENT LICENSE MUST BE INCLUDED IN THE DOCUMENTATION. IN ADDITION, APPLICANTS MUST PROVIDE A LETTER OF VERIFICATION FROM ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

- ❑ *RESOURCE AND REFERRAL AGENCY (CALL YOUR LOCAL R & R FOR LETTER)*
- ❑ *FAMILY CHILD CARE ASSOCIATION (CALL YOUR LOCAL ASSN. FOR LETTER)*

SECTION 2-B [redacted]

LANGUAGE DECLARATION:

I CERTIFY THAT I FLUENTLY SPEAK _____ LANGUAGE (INCLUDING SIGN LANGUAGE AND OTHER THAN ENGLISH) AND USE THIS LANGUAGE TO COMMUNICATE WITH CHILDREN, FAMILIES OR STAFF IN MY PROGRAM. I AGREE TO PROVIDE FURTHER DOCUMENTATION OF THIS LANGUAGE DECLARATION IF REQUESTED TO DO SO.

_____ _____ _____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT DATE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION 3

Part A (Check the box next to the highest level for which you qualify)

Important Note: Your current job title **does not** determine your stipend. Your **education level** determines your Corps stipend level and tier. Position titles in parentheses apply to corresponding levels of the Child Development Permit Matrix.

LEVEL 1

- ❑ TIER 1: $500 MAXIMUM (ASSOCIATE TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 12 UNITS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (ECE) OR CHILD DEVELOPMENT (CD)

- ❑ TIER 2: $750 MAXIMUM (ASSOCIATE TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 18 UNITS OF ECE OR CD

- ❑ TIER 3: $1000 MAXIMUM (ASSOCIATE TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE OR CD

- ❑ TIER 4: $1250 MAXIMUM (ASSOCIATE TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE OR CD *AND* 8 UNITS OF GENERAL EDUCATION (GE)

LEVEL 2

- ❑ TIER 1: $1500 MAXIMUM (TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE OR CD *AND* 16 UNITS OF GE

- ❑ TIER 2: $2500 MAXIMUM (MASTER TEACHER)
  I HAVE COMPLETED AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE /CD *AND* 16 UNITS OF GENERAL EDUCATION (GE), *AND*
  6 UNITS SPECIALIZATION
  2 UNITS ADULT SUPERVISION
  OR (SITE SUPERVISOR)
  AA DEGREE WITH 24 UNITS ECE/CD
  6 UNITS ADMINISTRATION
  2 UNITS ADULT SUPERVISION

- ❑ TIER 3: $6000 MAXIMUM (PROGRAM DIRECTOR)
  I HAVE COMPLETED A BA WITH AT LEAST 24 UNITS OF ECE/CD
  AND
  6 UNITS ADMINISTRATION
  2 UNITS ADULT SUPERVISION

Part B (Check any applicable)

- ❑ GRADUATE DEGREE: ADDITIONAL $500 MAXIMUM
  I HAVE A **MASTER'S DEGREE OR HIGHER.**

- ❑ BILINGUAL: ADDITIONAL $500 MAXIMUM
  I AM FLUENT IN AT LEAST ONE LANGUAGE (INCLUDING SIGN LANGUAGE) **OTHER THAN** ENGLISH, **AND USE IT IN MY JOB** WITH CHILDREN, PARENTS OR STAFF WHO SPEAK THAT LANGUAGE.

If you present a copy of your Child Development Permit, no transcripts are needed.

Applicants who wish to qualify under the Alternative Qualifications of the Child Development Permit Matrix may submit the required documentation (please refer to a Child Development Permit Matrix).

FOR CORPS ADVISOR'S USE ONLY:

I HAVE VERIFIED THAT THE APPLICANT QUALIFIES FOR THE FOLLOWING CORPS STIPEND:

Choose only one

- ❑ L1-T1
- ❑ L1-T2
- ❑ L1-T3
- ❑ L1-T4
- ❑ L2-T1
- ❑ L2-T2
- ❑ L2-T3

- ❑ GRADUATE DEGREE
- ❑ BILINGUAL

IN MAKING THIS DETERMINATION, I REVIEWED THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTATION:

- ❑ COLLEGE TRANSCRIPTS
- ❑ CHILD DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

DOCUMENTATION OF EMPLOYMENT FOR FAMILY CHILD CARE LICENSEES:

- ❑ LICENSE
- ❑ LETTER FROM R & R
- ❑ LETTER FROM CHILD CARE ASSN.
- ❑ OTHER

_____

_____
SIGNATURE OF CORPS ADVISOR

_____
DATE

I CERTIFY THAT ALL INFORMATION PROVIDED IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

_____ _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT DATE